

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2007-08**

IDAHO



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614 Expiration Date:
10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2007-08 ☒ Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Idaho State Board of Education
Address:
650 W. State St.
Boise, ID 83720-0037 Person to contact about this report:

Name: Tracie Bent
Telephone: 208-332-1582
Fax: 208-334-2632
e-mail: Tracie.Bent@osbe.idaho.gov

Mike Rush

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Tuesday, April 28, 2009, 4:13:43 PM

Signature Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009
5PM EST**

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's NCLB assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	9,321	7,845	84.2
4	9,044	7,256	80.2
5	8,362	6,156	73.6
6	6,570	4,822	73.4
7	4,690	3,369	71.8
8	4,229	3,064	72.5
High School	1,026	637	62.1
Total	43,242	33,149	76.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	9,288	7,415	79.8
4	9,004	7,095	78.8
5	8,336	6,762	81.1
6	6,554	5,126	78.2
7	4,683	3,598	76.8
8	4,227	3,578	84.6
High School	1,014	784	77.3
Total	43,106	34,358	79.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b) (3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,374	5,617	88.1
4	6,137	5,249	85.5
5	6,038	4,832	80.0
6	5,192	4,031	77.6
7	3,347	2,523	75.4
8	3,221	2,460	76.4
High School	1,034	766	74.1
Total	31,343	25,478	81.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,364	5,245	82.4
4	6,127	5,093	83.1
5	6,017	5,126	85.2
6	5,192	4,227	81.4
7	3,340	2,696	80.7
8	3,221	2,817	87.5
High School	1,023	861	84.2
Total	31,284	26,065	83.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals:

(1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,384
Limited English proficient students	9,565
Students who are homeless	629
Migratory students	2,312
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category sets B, C, D and E.

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,721
Asian or Pacific Islander	947
Black, non-Hispanic	992
Hispanic	18,028
White, non-Hispanic	55,292
Total	76,980
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category set A.

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	72	316	0	0	388
K	1,811	8,301	37	N<10	10,157
1	1,868	8,371	56	N<10	10,298
2	1,850	8,307	34	N<10	10,194
3	1,725	8,010	31	N<10	9,770
4	1,247	7,691	25	N<10	8,968
5	1,069	7,034	22	10	8,135
6	945	5,093	22	14	6,074
7	765	3,203	N<10	12	3,983
8	672	2,809	N<10	N<10	3,491
9	308	1,829	0	24	2,161
10	233	1,017	0	24	1,274
11	204	1,025	0	20	1,249
12	107	1,086	0	N<10	1,201
Ungraded	0	N<10	0	0	N<10
TOTALS	12,876	64,093	232	143	77,344
Comments:					

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X134, that is data group 670, category set A.

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections request data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	10,137
Reading/language arts	19,239
Science	3,374
Social studies	3,355
Vocational/career	
Other instructional services	361
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group 549, category set A.

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	2,513
Supporting guidance/advocacy	3,146
Other support services	257
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036, that is data group 549, category set B.

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	276.20	
Paraprofessionals ¹	331.10	76.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	14.90	
Clerical support staff	29.50	
Administrators (non-clerical)	40.80	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?" An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:*
 1. Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 2. Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 3. Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 4. Conducting parental involvement activities;
 5. Providing support in a library or media center;
 6. Acting as a translator; or
 7. Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.*
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>.*

1 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals3	537.00	67.8
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. 3 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the reporting program year July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	5
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules. The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	131
2. Adults participating	142
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	102
4. Participating children	160
a. Birth through 2 years	59
b. Age 3 through 5	77
c. Age 6 through 8	23
c. Above age 8	N<10
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and reenrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	66
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	68
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	31
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	0
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	14
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2008). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	25
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	22
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	44
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	40
5. Total families enrolled	131
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

In the space below, provide any explanatory information necessary for understanding the data provided in this section on performance indicators.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. The percentage of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading, as measured by the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE), was 100%; an increase from 78% in the 06-07 year. The significant gains were as a result of Improvement in data collection and an increased emphasis by programs on ensuring that participants attend sufficient hours to post-test.
 2. The percentage of LEP adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition was 83% using the CASAS test. This is an increase from 63% in the 06-07 year.
 3. The percentage of school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED was 42%. This decrease was a result of incomplete data from the two sites who serve primarily school-age adults.
 4. The percentage of non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED was 93%. This is an increase from 33% in the 06-07 year.
 5. The percentage of children entering kindergarten who achieved significant learning gains on measures of language development was 24% using the PPVT. This is a decrease from 88% in the 06-07 year, again due to incomplete data from two of the largest sites.
 6. The average number of letters (weighted average) children entering kindergarten as measured by the average number of letters on PALS PreK UpperCase Scale, was 30.
 7. The percentage of school-age children who read on grade level in Kindergarted was 40%, 1st grade: 100%, 2nd grade: 25%, and 3rd grade: 100%, as measured by the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI). This is a significant increase in all areas from the previous year (24%).
 8. The percentage of parents who improved on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities was 76% as measured by the Parent Education Profile (PEP Scale III). This is a significant increase from the previous year of 53%.
- The Idaho State Even Start program made significant gains in five areas. Overall, this is an improvement from previous years.

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2. Note:

Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	11	11	
CASAS	N<10	N<10	
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST			
CASAS	23	19	
TABE	10	N<10	
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	29	14	
GED			
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED	15	14	
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III					
PPVT-IV	38	N<10	N<10	N<10	
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III					
PPVT-IV	38	N<10	N<10	N<10	
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2008.
3. The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	35	N<10	N<10	30.0	
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	30	12	
1	N<10	N<10	
2	N<10	N<10	
3	N<10	N<10	
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I			
PEP Scale II			
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV	33	25	
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data – migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs at 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	227
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	835
K	330
1	438
2	404
3	330
4	355
5	313
6	324
7	296
8	303
9	280
10	236
11	151
12	127
Ungraded	77
Out-of-school	244
Total	5,270
Comments:	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1.

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	53
1	60
2	61
3	50
4	58
5	56
6	43
7	55
8	42
9	28
10	28
11	12
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	549
Comments: CSPR 0607 Idaho had not had a definition for Priority for Services. Therefore, the PFS count was populated through the counts of migrant students receiving reading and math services. However, in July 08, under the direction of the new Migrant Director, the State MEP developed a definition for Priority for Service in compliance with Title I-C regulations. The count in CSPR 0708 reflects the aspects of the approved PFS definition, thus explaining the difference from 0607 to 0708.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	95
K	239
1	334
2	272
3	213
4	226
5	192
6	186
7	181
8	163
9	159
10	121
11	86
12	67
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	21
Total	2,558
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also Children with Disabilities (IDEA) under Part B or Part C of the IDEA. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	15
K	12
1	17
2	14
3	19
4	19
5	22
6	19
7	16
8	21
9	14
10	14
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	211
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The totals are calculated automatically.

	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
Age/Grade	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	128	68	25	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	248	221	220	146
K	119	85	75	51
1	94	127	131	86
2	100	90	94	120
3	80	69	89	92
4	87	88	90	90
5	80	76	77	80
6	68	75	93	88
7	77	69	74	76
8	63	78	71	91
9	64	66	72	78
10	40	54	64	78
11	31	24	45	51
12	11	28	36	52
Ungraded	N<10	15	16	41
Out-of-school	53	62	66	63
Total	1,348	1,295	1,338	1,289
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	221
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	686
K	277
1	352
2	283
3	238
4	264
5	233
6	236
7	220
8	210
9	198
10	157
11	100
12	75
Ungraded	35
Out-of-school	180
Total	3,965
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

OMB NO. 1810-0614 Page 28

2.3.2 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of eligible migrant students.

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Total	30

Comments: Idaho's child count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. More families are settling permanently in their home base, and other families whose eligibility has expired are no longer seeking and/or obtaining qualifying work. Furthermore, issues surrounding immigration have made it more difficult to find and recruit eligible families as they choose to remain isolated and private out of fear. Lastly, another impact of the immigration issue is that fewer migrant families are moving to the state of Idaho.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your State	N<10
Comments: CSPR SY 006-07 indicated the Migrant program would begin collecting GED information in SY 07-08. However, the current Migrant director was not hired until July 2009. Therefore, Idaho MEP will continue to develop ways to track and collect Migrant GED data throughout SY 08-09.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State NCLB Assessments.

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	253	246
4	276	268
5	239	231
6	232	226
7	211	199
8	192	185
9		
10	172	167
11		
12		
Ungraded		
Total	1,575	1,522
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	253	252
4	276	273
5	239	237
6	232	230
7	211	210
8	192	187
9		
10	172	169
11		
12		
Ungraded		
Total	1,575	1,558
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1–3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the regular school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	15
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	149
K	271
1	389
2	331
3	282
4	311
5	266
6	275
7	253
8	245
9	238
10	192
11	123
12	104
Ungraded	10
Out-of-school	26
Total	3,480

Comments: Idaho's child count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. More families are settling permanently in their home base, and other families whose eligibility has expired are no longer seeking and/or obtaining qualifying work. Furthermore, issues surrounding immigration have made it more difficult to find and recruit eligible families as they choose to remain isolated and private out of fear. Lastly, another impact of the immigration issue is that fewer migrant families are moving to the state of Idaho.

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	49
1	57
2	55
3	46
4	55
5	49
6	38
7	49
8	35
9	26
10	26
11	12
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	500
Comments: CSPR 0607 Idaho had not had a definition for Priority for Services. Therefore, the PFS count was populated through the counts of Migrant students receiving reading and math services. However, in July 08, under the direction of the new Migrant director, the State MEP developed a definition for Priority for Service in compliance with Title I-C regulations. The count in CSPR reflects the aspects of the approved PFS definition, thus explaining the difference from 0607 to 0708.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: CSPR SY0607 utilized extended services counts for continuation of services counts. In July 2008 after the new MEP Director was hired, continuation of services was more clearly defined and a process for accurately collecting this data for SY0809 was developed and implemented. Idaho will add accurate Continuation of Services counts for Regular School year students in SY0809 data collection.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	89
K	251
1	344
2	281
3	241
4	255
5	204
6	218
7	219
8	206
9	189
10	160
11	93
12	83
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	18
Total	2,858
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	70	65	
K	243	196	
1	328	258	
2	262	210	
3	224	191	
4	214	200	
5	186	168	
6	172	171	
7	173	174	
8	146	156	
9	127	135	N<10
10	95	116	N<10
11	56	61	10
12	40	44	12
Ungraded	0	N<10	0
Out-of-school	17	16	0
Total	2,353	2,162	30
Comments: CSPR 0607 excluded the Migrant students from participation reports from the 47 schools serving Migrant studnet within the funded 54 Migrant districts that indicated Schoolwide Status and where MEP funds were consolidated. After a comprehensive explanation of consolidated funds in a schoolwide setting was communicated from the Idaho SDE,it was determined LEA's were not combining funds. For SY0708, The SDE Acting/Current Migrant Director and Title I Director advised districts not to consolidate migrant funds unless the unique needs of migrant students, as determined by an LEA Migrant Needs Assessment, have been met. High school credit accrual reflects the number of Migrant students participating in the PASS program.			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	15	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	133	37
K	229	24
1	330	57
2	271	45
3	244	43
4	256	51
5	232	48
6	237	56
7	220	81
8	204	89
9	211	85
10	158	73
11	112	53
12	83	32
Ungraded	10	N<10
Out-of-school	22	N<10
Total	2,967	792
<p>Comments: Idaho MEP's data quality continues to improve each school year with clear and consistent communication in further defining "support services" and "counseling services." Although Idaho does not have any counselors who are MEP funded, as indicated in 2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff, the counseling services received by 156 students were pertinent to providing guidance in educational and career opportunities. The counseling services indicated were provided by other MEP funded staff, not MEP funded counselors. Idaho will continue to seek clarification on the definition of "counseling services" to assure accurate reporting of MEP services. Idaho MEP's data quality continues to improve each school year with clear and consistent communication in further defining "support services" and "counseling services." As a result, the data collection is much more thorough and reflective of the actual services being provided to Migrant students.</p>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on Support Services:

- What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Idaho did not collect information on Referred Services for students in SY0607. Idaho will add Referred Services counts for students in SY0809 data collection.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is EDFacts file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	201
K	141
1	212
2	179
3	132
4	170
5	132
6	109
7	62
8	37
9	31
10	17
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,451
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	29
1	27
2	37
3	30
4	32
5	33
6	14
7	12
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	227
Comments: CSPR 0607 Idaho had not had a definition for Priority for Services. Therefore, the PFS count was populated through the counts of Migrant students receiving reading and math services. However, in July 2008, under the direction of the new Migrant Director, the State MEP developed a definition for Priority for Service in compliance with Title I-C regulations. The count in CSPR 0708 reflects the aspects of the approved PFS definition, thus explaining the difference from SY0607 to SY0708.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: CSPR SY0607 utilized extended services counts for continuation of services counts. In July 2008 after the new MEP Director was hired, continuation of services was more clearly defined and a process for accurately collecting this data for SY0809 was developed and implemented. Idaho will add accurate continuation of services counts for Summer students in SY0809 data collection.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are NOT considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	201
K	140
1	211
2	179
3	132
4	170
5	132
6	109
7	62
8	37
9	31
10	17
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,449
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	N<10	N<10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	195	192	
K	140	129	
1	211	203	
2	175	172	
3	132	121	
4	170	166	
5	131	128	
6	107	108	
7	61	62	
8	37	36	
9	31	29	N<10
10	15	15	N<10
11	N<10	N<10	N<10
12	N<10	N<10	N<10
Ungraded	N<10	N<10	0
Out-of-school	10	10	0
Total	1,430	1,385	20
Comments: Idaho MEP continues to improve its data collection quality. The count of migrant students participating in high school credit accrual reflects those migrant students participating in the PASS program, as collected through the Migrant MEP.			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	N<10	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	197	29
K	136	10
1	203	21
2	173	13
3	128	12
4	164	22
5	130	11
6	105	N<10
7	61	11
8	35	N<10
9	29	N<10
10	15	N<10
11	N<10	N<10
12	N<10	N<10
Ungraded	N<10	0
Out-of-school	10	0
Total	1,403	156
<p>Comments: Idaho MEP's data quality continues to improve each school year with clear and consistent communication in further defining "support services" and "counseling services." Although Idaho does not have any counselors who are MEP funded, as indicated in 2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff, the counseling services received by 156 students were pertinent to providing guidance in educational and career opportunities. The counseling services indicated were provided by other MEP funded staff, not MEP funded counselors. Idaho will continue to seek clarification on the definition of "counseling services" to assure accurate reporting of MEP services. Idaho MEP's data quality continues to improve each school year with clear and consistent communication in further defining "support services" and "counseling services." As a result, the data collection is much more thorough and reflective of the actual services being provided to migrant students.</p>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on Support Services:

- What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Idaho did not collect information on Referred Services for Summer students in SY0708. Idaho will add Referred Services counts for Summer students in SY08-09 data collection.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	273
K	278
1	400
2	342
3	288
4	316
5	272
6	277
7	255
8	249
9	239
10	192
11	123
12	105
Ungraded	11
Out-of-school	30
Total	3,666
Comments: CSPR 0607 utilized ANY migrant student who participated in an MEP funded project during regular and summer terms, regardless of instructional and support services for the criteria in MEP participation. However, CSPR 0708 populated the MEP participation counts based on the specified definition, "participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year."	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4 School Data

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	278
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,881
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	0
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0
Comments: The SDE Migrant Director, working with the Title I Director, advised LEA's not to consolidate Migrant funds in a schoolwide setting unless the unique need of migrant students, as determined through a Migrant Needs Assessment, have been met. Therefore, in SY0708 Idaho has no schools where MEP funds were consolidated in schoolwide programs.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children participating in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	268	3,865
Regular school year – school day/extended day		
Summer/intersession only	40	1,277
Year round	308	5,142
Comments: No information received on Regular school year -school day/extended day counts.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project? A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.*
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.*
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects? Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).*
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.*
- e. *What are Year Round projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.*

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on the MEP State director

- How is the FTE calculated for the State director? Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.*
- Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.*

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	36	19.90	153	115.30
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	144	81.70	155	107.50
Recruiters	36	22.30	23	17.30
Records transfer staff	9	4.00	11	7.10
Comments: One factor affecting the percentage change in FTE's from CSPR SY06-07 to SY07-8 is the decrease in Idaho's Migrant child count, thus resulting in less Migrant funding to LEA's. This is resulting in LEA's funding teachers, paraprofessionals and records transfer staff with multiple funding sources and distributing time working with MEP and non-MEP students reflecting the percentage the staff member is funded with MEP and non-MEP funds.				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*
- c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*
- e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	139	80.00	146	93.70
Comments: One factor affecting the percentage change in FTE's from CSPR SY06-07 to SY07-8 is the decrease in Idaho's Migrant child count, thus resulting in less Migrant funding to LEA's. This is resulting in LEA's funding teachers, paraprofessionals and records transfer staff with multiple funding sources and distributing time working with MEP and non-MEP students reflecting the percentage the staff member is funded with MEP and non-MEP funds.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	3	179
Adult corrections	8	365
Other	0	0
Total	11	277

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	3
Adult Corrections	8
Other	0
Total	11
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	647	720	0
Long Term Students Served	0	0	647	95	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	21	23	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	N<10	N<10	0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	18	N<10	0
Hispanic	0	0	127	131	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	478	547	0
Total	0	0	647	712	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	561	620	0
Female	0	0	86	100	0
Total	0	0	647	720	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	N<10	0	0
12	0	0	18	0	0
13	0	0	54	0	0
14	0	0	90	0	0
15	0	0	149	0	0
16	0	0	162	0	0
17	0	0	153	19	0
18	0	0	13	89	0
19	0	0	0	147	0
20	0	0	0	209	0
21	0	0	0	256	0
Total	0	0	647	720	0

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Additional race/ethnicity categories for Adult Corrections other 4 and unknown 4. Many offenders are of mixed race and these fall into that category.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	3	2	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	3	2	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	3	7	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	647	5	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	24	2	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	24	2	0
Earned a GED	0	24	2	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	24	2	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	4	0	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	3	0	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	647	37	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	0	3	0	0
Obtained employment	0	0	0	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pretested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	134	N<10	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	178	25	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	18	10	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	N<10	N<10	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	N<10	N<10	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	19	N<10	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	128	10	0
Comments:				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	138	16	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	178	26	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	10	N<10	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	N<10	0	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	12	N<10	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	17	N<10	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	136	11	0
Comments:				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	8	71
Neglected programs	2	87
Juvenile detention	8	14
Juvenile corrections	5	283
Other	0	0
Total	23	47

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	4
Comments:	

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The

total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	8
Neglected programs	2
Juvenile detention	8
Juvenile corrections	5
Other	0
Total	23
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	672	97	2,282	660	0
Total Long Term Students Served	271	67	70	181	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	N<10	103	14	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	N<10	N<10	12	16	0
Black, non-Hispanic	13	N<10	44	23	0
Hispanic	71	N<10	550	137	0
White, non-Hispanic	556	80	1,573	470	0
Total	672	97	2,282	660	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	367	62	1,671	506	0
Female	305	35	611	154	0
Total	672	97	2,282	660	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	N<10	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	N<10	N<10	0	0	0
8	N<10	0	0	0	0
9	17	N<10	N<10	0	0
10	20	N<10	N<10	0	0
11	18	N<10	N<10	0	0
12	29	N<10	18	17	0
13	45	10	72	22	0
14	45	17	218	67	0
15	93	10	406	93	0
16	139	20	512	158	0
17	148	22	646	173	0
18	74	0	393	120	0
19	15	0	0	N<10	0
20	N<10	0	0	N<10	0
21	0	0	0	0	0

Total	672	97	2,282	660	0
-------	-----	----	-------	-----	---

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	7	2	10	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	3	1	4	0
Awarded GED(s)	5	1	7	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	154	56	342	0
Enrolled in a GED program	186	6	130	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	167	43	1,292	0
Earned a GED	104	N<10	59	0
Obtained high school diploma	N<10	N<10	12	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	36	N<10	17	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	34	N<10	11	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	130	0	112	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	28	0	39	0
Obtained employment	140	0	80	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	84	49	187	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	191	62	231	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	0	30	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	23	N<10	44	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	40	25	60	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	46	18	35	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	78	17	62	0
Comments: Need explanation				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	102	57	195	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	194	65	230	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	0	12	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	23	N<10	40	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	67	28	71	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	56	28	42	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	46	N<10	65	0
Comments:				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students who carried a weapon (gun, knife, club, etc...) on school property within 30 days of the survey. YRBS survey conducted every other year starting with 2001.	YRBS Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: N/A- survey not administered this year	2005-06: N/A Survey not administered this year	10%	2001
				2006-07: 9%			
				2007-08: N/A not administered this year			
Comments: Statewide enrollment increased by 7,000 students from 2006 / 2007 to 2007 / 2008, this presented significant challenges in reducing risk behaviors. The YRBS will be administered in the Spring of 2009, the SDE will submit new data as it becomes available.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property (in the twelve months preceding the survey).	YRBS Survey	Biennial	2001	2005-06: N/A survey not administered this year.	2005-06: N/A Survey not administered this year.	12.8%	
				2006-07: 12.3%			
				2007-08: N/A Survey not administered this year			
Comments: Statewide enrollment increased by 7,000 students from 2006 / 2007 to 2007 / 2008, this presented significant challenges in reducing risk behaviors. The YRBS will be administered in the Spring of 2009, the SDE will submit new data as it becomes available.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students offered, sold or given an illegal drug on school property (in the 12 months preceding	YRBS	Biennial	2001	2005-06: N/A Survey not administered this year	2005-06: N/A Survey not administered this year	23.2%	
				2006-07: 25.1%			

the survey).				2007-08: N/A Survey not administered this year			

Comments: Statewide enrollment increased by 7,000 students from 2006 / 2007 to 2007 / 2008, this presented significant challenges in reducing risk behaviors. The YRBS will be administered in the Spring of 2009, the SDE will submit new data as it becomes available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06:	2005-06:		
				2006-07:			
				2007-08:			

Comments:

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Any product containing at least 0.5 alcohol by volume or weight." Examples include beer, wine and spirits (vodka, gins, whiskey, etc.)
Illicit drug related	A substance regulated by the Controlled Substances Act: examples are marijuana, meth, PCP, designer drugs, heroin, etc.
Violent incident without physical injury	See comments below.
Violent incident with physical injury	See comments below.
Weapons possession	All objects, devices, instrurments, materials or substances used or intended to be used to inflict death or serious injury.

Comments: Idaho's definitions for "Alcohol related, Illicit drug related, and Weapons possession" mirror federal definitions. Idaho will create definitions of the violent incidents with / without physical injury that match federal definitions, and formalize definitions and reporting structure for data to be available for SY 08/09.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The Safe and Drug Free program received suspension in last year's SY 0607 CSPR for reporting "Violent Incident with Physical Injury" data until SY 0809. The process to ensure that districts report valid Violent Incident with Physical Injury data in the State Collection Application is on track for SY 0809.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The Safe and Drug Free program received suspension in last year's SY 0607 CSPR for reporting "Violent Incident with Physical Injury" data until SY 0809. The process to ensure that districts report valid Violent Incident with Physical Injury data in the State Collection Application is on track for SY 0809.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The Safe and Drug Free program received suspension in last year's SY 0607 CSPR for reporting "Violent Incident with Physical Injury" data until SY 0809. The process to ensure that districts report valid Violent Incident with Physical Injury data in the State Collection Application is on track for SY 0809.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The Safe and Drug Free program received suspension in last year's SY 0607 CSPR for reporting "Violent Incident with Physical Injury" data until SY 0809. The process to ensure that districts report valid Violent Incident with Physical Injury data in the State Collection Application is on track for SY 0809.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	192	117
6 through 8	134	117
9 through 12	118	115
Comments: Suspensions and Expulsions increased due to statewide emphasis on uniform enforcement of weapons policies, as a rural state in which many hunters live rifles in trucks on school grounds has been a common occurrence. We are working to change the acceptance of bringing weapons on campus for any reason.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	10	117
6 through 8	18	117
9 through 12	40	115
Comments: Suspensions and Expulsions increased due to statewide emphasis on uniform enforcement of weapons policies, as a rural state in which many hunters live rifles in trucks on school grounds has been a common occurrence. We are working to change the acceptance of bringing weapons on campus for any reason.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	117
6 through 8	80	117
9 through 12	183	115
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	117
6 through 8	0	117
9 through 12	N<10	115
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	117
6 through 8	139	117
9 through 12	525	115
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	117
6 through 8	N<10	117
9 through 12	31	115
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
Yes	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
Yes	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
Yes	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
Yes	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
Yes	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
Yes	Other Specify 1
No Response	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho SEA recently created and filled a new FTE position with the title: Parental Involvement Coordinator. This position has aided tremendously in our parental involvement efforts and in our efforts to "de-mystify" how SEAs and LEAs function.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of ESEA.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of ESEA, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	125	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	125	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The 4 strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 1920, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	516,707	96.4
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	535,927	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
2. That did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	107	40
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	13	7
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	5	5
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	125	52
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	1
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	1
Parental involvement activities	0
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	1
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho only had one school that received an award under the Rural and Low-Income Schools program for the 2007-2008 program year. This district has integrated those funds to supplement and support activities and monitoring plans planned for in the district's consolidated plan programs. The focus was tied to increased student proficiency which supports Performance Goal 1 (By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics) and Performance Goal 2 (All students will graduate from high school) from the States June 2002 Consolidated State application.

Tied to Performance Goal 2, a dramatic decrease in student dropouts can be traced from the 2002-03 school year to the 2007-08 school year at all grade levels and with all ethnicity subgroups.

Comparative Dropout Calculations For Grades 9-12

Year 9th Grade 10th Grade 11th Grade 12th Grade Grades 9-12

Dropouts Dropouts Dropouts Dropouts Dropouts

Event Rate Event Rate Event Rate Event Rate Event Rate

2007-08	240	1.10%	374	1.78%	441	2.26%	534	2.87%	1589	1.96%
2006-07	343	1.57%	474	2.29%	602	3.08%	690	3.76%	2,109	2.62%
2005-06	387	1.81%	509	2.48%	581	3.05%	623	3.49%	2,100	2.66%
2004-05	409	1.92%	557	2.77%	692	3.68%	703	4.02%	2,361	3.04%
2003-04	399	1.92%	619	3.10%	709	3.84%	668	3.82%	2,395	3.12%
2002-03	516	2.52%	742	3.83%	835	4.64%	827	4.73%	2,920	3.88%

Percentage of Dropouts by Ethnicity

Native

Year White Black Hispanic American Asian Total

2007-08	1.74%	1.49%	3.50%	2.70%	1.01%	1.96%
2006-07	2.28%	2.45%	5.16%	3.89%	1.91%	2.62%
2005-06	2.16%	4.78%	5.87%	5.49%	1.24%	2.66%
2004-05	2.57%	3.77%	6.61%	5.70%	2.24%	3.04%
2003-04	2.67%	4.19%	6.83%	7.01%	1.34%	3.12%
2002-03	3.40%	3.77%	7.29%	7.55%	1.59%	3.81%

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2007-08?

Yes

Comments: We had two districts that transferred money from Title II-A to Title V-A in the amount of \$30,887

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	3
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from and to each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	3	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	3
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		0

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	41,704.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	41,704.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		0.00
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.